PARERGON

AUGUST 1981

Number 30

Bulletin of the Australian and New Zealand Association for Medieval and Renaissance Studies

No. 30 August 1981

Contents

Issued to Members of the Association. Subscription $10 p.a. (Students $4 p.a.) Edited by J.C. Eade c/o Humanities Research Centre, Australian National University, Canberra, A.C.T.

This issue continues the selection of papers from the Association's Ninth Conference, held at Macquarie University in February 1981.

I am pleased to report that this number contains as wide a cross-section of topics as any we have so far produced. It is to be hoped that this widening of focus will be sustained in the future.

J.C.E.

Casus belli: Early Medieval Versions of the Origins of the Trojan War

When what we know as Homer's *Iliad* took the shape which has come down to us over two-and-a-half millennia, the poet could count upon widespread knowledge of the general outlines of the story of Troy. As Richmond Lattimore puts it: 'although Homer has selected a series of events occupying a few weeks in the tenth year of the war, and does not deal with either beginning or end, he knows the beginning and the end. The Achaians came for the sake of Menelaos, to win back Helen whom Paris had carried off. That is understood, and alluded to quite often. And he knows, and all the characters in his story pretty well know, that Troy will fall.'[1] Indeed it is not until Book XX. 200-43 that Aineias sets out the history of Troy for Achilleus' benefit, and only in Book XXI. 441-60 does Poseidon reveal the reason for his implacability. The action of the poem is all but complete when in Book XXIV. 25-30 we hear the first allusion to the Judgment of Paris, the cause of the animosity towards Troy which moved Hera and Athene to seek the city's downfall.

The events leading up to the ten-year siege became the subject of another poem in the epic cycle, the *Cypria*, of uncertain authorship and now lost, but evidently still known in some form[2] until the end of the classical period. Little or nothing of the epic cycle survived in western Europe after the sixth century A.D., however; only the *Iliad* retained poetic form, reduced to the 1200 hexameters of the skeletal *Ilias latina*,[3] from which all matter inessential to the central action has been excised—and that includes its roots in events long past. In prose the mythographical writers recorded many of the main details, scattered through their compilations, as did scholiasts and commentators, for whom the ordering of material was determined by the text being glossed.[4] Many of these works suffered large-scale interpolation or abridgment in transmission, as modern critical editions testify in their apparatus;[5] accurate determination of sources for later works is rendered virtually impossible at times by the sheer quantity of well-attested variant readings.

The *Ilias latina* was merely one of the four extended Troy narratives to have survived into the early Middle Ages, and by no means the most widely known. Equally unfamiliar in the West, despite the impressive credentials attached to its Latin version, was the late Greek prose narrative going under the name of Dictys Cretensis, supposedly the journal of a Greek combatant in the Trojan campaign.[6] The *Ephemerides belli Troiani* begins with an assembly of Greek magnates in Crete, among whom is Menelaus of Sparta (i-ii). Taking advantage of Menelaus' absence, Paris of Troy so far abuses the privileges due to him as Menelaus' guest as to carry off his host's wife Helen, together with a large quantity of treasure (iii). The Greeks' assembly transfers to Sparta and becomes a council of war (iii-iv). On the voyage home, blown off course by strong winds, Paris lands in Sidon, where he slays the king and adds his treasure to the spoils from Sparta (v). In the meantime Palamedes is putting the Greek case in the Trojan court; he draws attention to Paris' grave discourtesy in Sparta, reminds Priam of the long-standing hostility between Greeks and Trojans over Ganymedes, and ends by threatening open war if Helen is not returned (vi). His eloquence moves many of those present, so that it is a worried Priam who adjourns the debate until Paris can attend and answer for himself (vi). But the rich spoils the young prince brings home, together with the beauty of Helen and her retinue, quickly win over the dubious and fainthearted (vii-viii); Helen hardly needs to plead kinship with Priam and Hecuba, or to claim that she has brought from Sparta only what was hers by right (ix), in order to gain total acceptance by the Trojans, none of whom seems able or willing to utter anything to the contrary, though Antenor bears himself honourably throughout (x). War is now inevitable, and the Greek ambassadors barely escape ambush as they leave Troy (xi). So the Greeks gather their forces for the long-delayed assault on Troy (xii-xiv).

My procedure here is to examine the occurrence of words on the base **veng,*[1] seeking to interpret them in the light of a model of vengeance established by reflection on some dictionary definitions.

Examination of the 16 examples shows that there are two interpretations of events within the text and that these interpretations are contradictory. Marc is seen to be at the heart of the contradiction, in that in different circumstances and under certain conditions he shares now one interpretation and now another. In itself this is a rather dramatic demonstration of the conclusion Perinis reaches when he reports to Arthur concerning Marc: 'Sometimes he is here, sometimes there' (v.3433). In the text as we have it, incomplete, it is scarcely possible to speak of resolving contradictions; there is discernible, nevertheless, a move towards the resolution of contradiction, by the repudiation and confounding of one interpretation and the progressive elimination of its proponents.

The model of vengeance used in this analysis was based on the following definition: 'a penalty exacted or a punishment inflicted on persons for a wrong done in the absence of suitable reparation being made'. Thus it is a way of seeking redress, of finding satisfaction, of restoring balance or justice.

The 16 occurrences of **veng* fall into two patterns. Pattern I may be seen in examples 1, 8, 9 and 10.

1. v. 786 Li fel dient: "Sire, or te *venge.*"
(The vilains say: "Sire, avenge yourself").[2]

(The barons to Marc when the evidence of blood is seen in the flour on the floor scene.)

8/9 vv. 1902-4 Vien tost, ja seron d'eus *vengiez.*
Rois, s'or n'en prens aspre *venjance,*
N'as droit en terre, sanz doutance.
(Come quickly and we shall be straightway avenged on them.
King, if you do not now take strong vengeance, you have beyond doubt lost your right to rule this land.)

(The forester to Marc reporting his discovery of the lovers in the forest of Morrois.)

10 vv.1953-6 De la cité s'en est issuz
Et dist mex veut estre penduz
Qu'il ne prenge de ceus *venjance*
Que li ont fait tel avilance.
(He went out of the city saying to himself he would rather be hanged than not take vengeance on those who had caused him such disgrace.)

(King Marc rides out on his own to be shown the lovers in the forest.)

In this pattern the wrong-doers (cause of an offence to King Marc, the wronged party) are Tristran and Iseut. The person to take vengeance for the wrong done, as recommended by the barons(1) by the forester acting in terms of the King's ban (8) (9) and as accepted by Marc himself (10), is King Marc. The interpretation of events operating in this pattern, based initially on an absolute standard (cf. vv. 589-609), is the one proposed by the barons and their allies. Marc himself is led to act on the basis of this interpretation by the baron's manipulation and persuasion.

The act of vengeance proposed by Marc is to be punishment by death, initially by fire, and subsequently, after the lovers' escape and the official ban imposed on them by Marc, by his own sword. Initially forms of reparation are offered, counselled, but refused by Marc. What motivates this plan of vengeance is the evidence which shows, or suggests, than an offence has been committed by Tristran and Iseut in sleeping together in the King's chamber in the Flour on the Floor Scene, and in the forest (the discovery of the lovers in Morrois by the forester).

Pattern II has as its support the other 12 occurrences.

2. vv. 906-8 Qui m'oceist, si garisiez,
Ce fust grant joie, beaus amis;
Encor en fust *vengement* pris."
(If I were killed and you were safe, it would be a great joy, fair friend: vengeance would yet be taken.)

(Iseut's lament as Tristran is led out, bound, to be burnt)

3. vv.996-8 Et se en l'art, jamais an cele
Ne montez vos, se vos briment
N'en prenez enprés *vengement*!
(And if she is burnt, never get into the saddle again if you do not take vengeance without delay.)

(Governal to Tristran after Tristran's escape.)

4. vv.1005-7 S'or estiez, beau sire, ocis,
Que *vengement* n'en fust ainz pris,
Jamais nul jor n'avroie joie."
(If you were killed now, fair sir, before vengeance had been taken, I should never be happy again.)

(Governal to Tristran after Tristran's escape.)

5. vv. 1023-7 Governal dist: "Ne te haster!
Tel chose te puet Dex doner
Que te porras mot mex *venger;*
N'i avras pas tel destorbier
Con tu porroies or avoir.
(Governal said: "Do not be in a hurry. God may provide you with a far better opportunity for avenging yourself, when you will not encounter the difficulty that you might have now.)

(Governal to Tristran after Tristran's escape.)

6. vv.1105-20 A vos ne mesferoit il mie;
Mais vos barons, en vos ballie
S'il les trovout, nes vilonast?
Encor en ert la terre en gast.
Sire, certes, ne quier noier,
Qui avroit sol un escueir
Por moi destruit ne a feu mis,

Se iere roi de set païs,
Ses me metroit il en balence
Ainz que n'en fust prise *venjance.*
Pensez que de si franche feme,
Qu'il amena de lointain reigne,
Que lui ne poist s'ele est destruite?
Ainz en avra ancor grant luite.
Rois, rent la moi, par la merite
Que servi t'ai tote ma vite."

(To you he would do no harm; but your barons, if he found them in your domains, would he not ill-treat them? Your land will yet be ravaged as a result. Sire, indeed I do not seek to hide the fact that if anyone had even so much as a squire of his destroyed or burnt on account of me and I were the king of seven territories, yet I would expect him to place them in jeopardy rather than that vengeance should not be taken for his squire. Do you think then that Tristran will not be justifiably aggrieved if so noble a woman as Iseut is destroyed, a woman whom he brought here from a distant kingdom? There will on the contrary be great discord resulting from that. King, hand her over to me by the merit I have earned in serving you all my life.)

(Dinas, the seneschal, speaks to King Marc.)

7. vv.1702-3 Dit mex veut estre mis au vent
Que il de lui d'ait la *venjance;*

(Governal said to himself that he would rather let his ashes be scattered to the winds than not take vengeance on the baron.)

(Governal observes one of the barons hunting alone in the forest.)

11. vv.2763-4 Dex les *venga* de toz ces quatre,
Qui vout le fier orguel abatre.

(God, whose will is to bring down arrogant pride, avenged them on all these four.)

(Narrator's comment.)

12. vv.3191-9 Il m'ont assez adesentu,
Et je lor ai trop consentu.
N'i a mais rien del covertir.
Par lor parler, par lor mentir,
Ai mon nevo de moi chacié.
N'ai mais cure de lor marchié.
Prochainement s'en revendra,
Des trois felons me *vengera;*
Par lui serong encor pendu."

(They have tested me enough already and I have given in to them too much; there is nothing further to be gained by being swayed by their opinion. Because of their lying counsels I have driven my nephew away. I have no further concern for what they may advise. My nephew will soon come back and avenge me on the three villains; through him they will yet be hanged.)

(Marc speaks to Iseut after the barons have further demanded a public oath from Iseut.)

13. vv.3336-9 Ja n'avrai mais bain d'eve chaude
Tant qu'a m'espee aie *venjance*
De ceus qui li ont fait pesance;
Il sont traïtre fel prové.

(I shall not have another bath in hot water until I have taken vengeance with my sword on the men who are causing her so much grief. They have proved themselves to be wicked traitors.)

(Tristran to Perinis when he learns of the public oath demanded of Yseut.)

14. v.3506 Cist penseront de lui *vengier"*
(These men [Gawain, Girflet and Yvain] will see to avenging her.)

(Arthur to Perinis when he learns of the public oath demanded of Iseut.)

15. vv.4433-5 "Se Dex me gart," fail il, "au suen,
Vez les treces Denoalen,
Ge t'ai de lui pris la *venjance.*

(So may God keep me for his own, here is Denoalan's hair; I have taken vengeance for you on him.)

(Tristran to Iseut after the killing of Denoalen.)

16. vv.4468-71 Dex, qui le tuen santisme cors
Por le pueple meïs a mort,
Lai moi *venjance* avoir du tort
Que cil felon muevent vers moi!"

(God, who allowed your own most holy body to suffer death for your people's sake, let me avenge myself for the wrong that these villains stir up against me.)

(Tristran's prayer immediately prior to shooting Godwin with his bow.)

In this counter-pattern the wrong-doers are the barons and their allies. The person to take vengeance is Tristran acting as defender of Iseut or as defender of the King and his interests. Governal does act as both a substitute (cf. vv.1710-8) and a co-avenger with Tristran; Gawain, Girlet and Evain are prepared to act as Tristran substitutes. (cf. Gawain's comment vv.3466-7.)

The interpretation of events operating in this pattern is one proposed or approved by Tristran, Iseut, Governal, Dinas, King Arthur and his knights, God and the narrator. Finally Marc himself appears to act with more heartfelt conviction at least in the implementation of this model of vengeance.

The acts of vengeance proposed in pattern II include death by hanging, by a lance, by the sword, by an arrow and by a sling-shot. The acts of vengeance accomplished are death by beheading with a sword, by the sword in jousting, by the sword in an ambush and by an arrow.

No act of reparation for the offence seems possible. The only recourse effectively open to the barons to avoid vengeance is to take shelter behind, and act through, the King's authority. Without that they are nothing.

We should note that Marc is present in both schemes as a wronged party. The possibility of his acting as a wrong-doer also exists in both patterns; for in I (cf. exs. 8/9) it is suggested that he will cause offence to his own authority as King sufficient to merit being deprived of that authority if he does *not* take vengeance on Tristran and Iseut; in II, while Marc is carefully excluded from the pursuit of vengeance, yet the possibility of his inflicting damage on his kingdom clearly exists if he *does* pursue his plan of vengeance on Iseut (ex.6).

In juxtasposing these two patterns we should note that in the second Tristran is the avenger *par excellence,* that acts of vengeance are effectively accomplished, and that the execution is by the sword (or a sword substitute).

In Pattern I it is Marc who is led (or thrown) into the role of avenger. Two quite different means of vengeance are proposed by him (both fire and the sword), but neither is effectively accomplished. There is nevertheless one decisive, swift act of vengeance taken by Marc, not revealed by our initial collection of examples, in which Marc effectively takes vengeance on the dwarf, one of the chief opponents also of Tristran and Iseut in Pattern II. This he accomplishes by execution by the sword for a wrong committed against himself. (vv.1306-50) The dwarf must be punished since he has broken the King's trust by bruiting abroad a private counsel that is damaging to the king and the interests of good order in the kingdom. He states that Marc has horses' ears. Moreover the dwarf is himself accused of being the cause of the fault in question. This scene is emblematic of the vengeance Tristran must ultimately take on the barons, for the barons too subsequently must be punished for betraying the trust placed in them by Marc, for bruiting abroad private information damaging to the good order of the kingdom, and for being in a real sense a cause of the fault, since it is only through their repeated ruses, deviously engineered, that the relationship of Tristran and Iseut becomes a problematic fault by being made public.

The analysis so far has established the existence of forms of conflict and of contradiction within the text. Marc appears central to the conflict and contradiction.[2] Attempts to explain his role in the text have made him a foolish and easily-duped cuckold, or a psychologically weak and indecisive character given to inexplicable and irrational fits of violent anger and maudlin pity. I would maintain that these psychological explanations do justice neither to Marc nor to the social and institutional aspects of the text.[4]

How does the conflict arise and what is the nature of Marc's dilemma in particular? One way of answering this question is to look back at our model of vengeance. If there are different interpretations of actions requiring vengeance, then those contradictory interpretations are based on different criteria, different sets of conventions. Now I would argue that there is a standard of order accepted as the norm in Beroul's text: it may be stated quite simply in terms of the Augustinian notions of *pax* and *ordo.*[5] The King's role is to ensure peace, which is defined not only as the absence of war but also as the establishment and maintenance of moral values based on good will and responsibility within a hierarchically established social order. The Queen's role is to assist and support the King and act in consort with him: the vassal's role is defined by the solemn nature of the mutually binding feudal-bond involving fealty, service, good counsel and mutual protection.

We might call all this the standard of social order and peace. Thus two binary axes, important if not essential to the good order of the kingdom, are constituted:[6] a Marc-Iseut axis with Iseut as Marc's wife destined to act as Queen, and a Marc-Tristran axis, with Tristran as the nephew of the King, the most proven protector of the kingdom's good, and a possible

heir to the kingdom.[7] The close institutional bond between Tristran and Marc may be paralleled by that between Gawain and Arthur, or (to take an example from outside the text) that between Roland and Charlemagne.

There is, however, another standard which is implicitly invoked, but scarcely represented, by the barons. They initially appeal to an ostensibly objective criterion—what we might call public orthodox religious morality. Given the absolutes to which the barons and their allies appeal in their pursuit of Tristran and Iseut, it is instructive to observe the grossly surreptitious means they use to achieve their ends. Now if it is objected that Tristran, Iseut and their allies (including the hermit Ogrin) engage in gross deceit also, that objection may be a way of illustrating the conflict implied in the operation of the two standards. Viewed in terms of the absolute standard, all may stand accused of gross deceit; but judged according to the dictates of social peace and order, the actions of Tristran and Iseut and their allies are directed towards the maintenance of that order. The actions of the barons and their allies is towards its disruption and destruction. The norm appealed to by the barons, then, is shown to be quite inappropriate and inadequate when it is used as a standard for determining appropriate action to deal with the real or possible *social* consequences resulting from the love relationship between Tristran and Iseut. The third binary axis, the prime cause of the conflict, is constituted by Tristran and Iseut.

Nor is it that questions of orthodox religious morality are ignored or denied by Beroul, as some critics have suggested. Contemporary distinctions (such as those suggested by Abelard) relating to intention and consent of the will are adequate to exonerate Tristran and Iseut from guilt in that sense.[8] But the barons are scarcely interested in such distinctions; they are wrong in judging the love of Tristran and Iseut on the basis of crudely applied objective and external criteria. They are shown to be even more seriously at fault in using these same criteria to level accusations of disloyalty at Tristran and Iseut, imputing thereby that the lovers are acting treacherously against social peace and order.

Now it cannot be denied that the love of Tristran and Iseut does threaten the rule of peace and order—it *is* disruptive. They too become acutely aware of that dimension of their relationship immediately after the cessation of the power of the philtre. And they do acknowledge fault, not in terms of infringing absolute morality, but as an involuntary infraction of social order. But that the kind of disruption which flows inevitably from their love should merit accusations of disloyalty and treachery requiring dire forms of punishment is a view vigorously resisted by the narrator.[9]

Marc's dilemmas are not easily resolved. As King he is bound to give serious heed to the counsel of his barons. He is aware of the standard of morality they are using; given the long-standing power of that standard, he cannot dismiss it at once and out of hand; it is only gradually and through a series of carefully coordinated incidents (the execution of the dwarf, the behaviour of the dog Husdent, the lovers observed in the forest, the rejection of the barons on the burn-out heath) that he comes to understand three things: that the barons' standard is inappropriate; that the motives of the barons in using that standard of judgment in the particular circumstances are malicious, and thirdly that the barons themselves are culpable when measured against the standard of peace and order. It is therefore they who merit punishment as disloyal and treacherous vassals.

Furthermore Marc has to learn to subordinate any personal feelings of anger as a wronged husband to the imperatives of social peace and order. His anger and his desire to carry out a private act of destructive vengeance against the lovers whom he expects to find in an adulterous embrace in the forest is in no way feigned (ex.10). As Jonin has pointed out in his study of the legal aspects of the *Coutumiers* of medieval France, an act of private vengeance performed by a

husband against a wife and/or lover caught in the act was not unfavourably judged.[10] But although Marc is heir to that mentality of feudal vendetta he is, in the circumstances, able to rise above it. It is not only Tristran and Iseut who are protected by their clothes and the naked sword placed between them in their sleep of healthy exhaustion—it is Marc also (cf. vv. 1966-8). Marc's moment of truth is that moment in which, sweating with anger, his sword raised over the sleeping lovers, he observes Iseut's tunic, the separated mouths and the naked sword. Marc's intention of vengeance is arrested.

The burning rays of the fiery sun are covered up, shut out by Marc as he places his fur gloves on Iseut's face. In these few moments then, Marc turns aside and rejects both fire (the purging and punishing fire of an absolutist standard) which had threatened them both earlier and the angry sword of his private vendetta. He acknowledges the prior demands of social peace and order which must bind king, queen and the kingdom's chief protector/avenger by the exchange of swords and rings.[11]

While the reconciliation of the interests of Marc, Tristran and Iseut is not yet complete, the keystone to its subsequent possibility has been laid. Tristran and Iseut are still under the power of the philtre, and it is this more than anything else which prevents them from recognising at that moment what has now more clearly appeared to Marc: the prior demands of social order. Still fearing pursuit, the lovers flee (like Frocin the dwarf before them) to Wales, an act of self exile to a place outside the bounds of Marc's authority. The way back for them is to be via the reconciliation negotiated by Ogrin, and that is only possible once the effects of the potion have worn off.

The reconciliation both of Marc and Iseut, and of Marc and Tristran involves a redefinition of those two axes in the narrative in such a way that they will not deny the existence of a third axis involving Tristran and Iseut. That axis too will need to be redefined before the required harmony can be achieved. The movement towards a resolution of the contradiction involves not only the repudiation and confounding of the interpretation of events propounded by the barons and their actual elimination, it must also involve a resolution of the conflict between Marc, Tristran, and Iseut in such a way as to form a completely harmonious triadic relation.

The physical love of Tristran and Iseut, prime cause of the conflict, is never denied by the narrator nor by Tristran and Iseut to each other. For the sake of maintaining peace and order the lovers attempt to conceal their love from public recognition or to cancel any of its possible deleterious effects by any legal means at their disposal; for the aim of the law in the exercise of justice is the maintenance of peace and order. Only when the adulterous relationship is made public and recognised as a scandal will an injury be seen to have been done to the King, a wrong which will demand an act of reparation or failing that, of vengeance.

The point has already been made that the emergence of a Tristran-Iseut axis must place the Marc-Tristran and the Marc-Iseut axes in jeopardy. But neither Marc, Tristran nor Iseut have anything to gain by a public recognition of fault existing in Tristran and Iseut. For Tristran and Iseut such public revelation would provide grounds for accusations of disloyalty and when it does occur it prevents them for a time from being able to fulfill their proper roles in society. Marc has nothing to gain by a public recognition of a relation between Tristran and Iseut, since it would deprive him of the acknowledged liberator of the kingdom and of his queen. He is in fact extremely loth to suspect any fault and is only too eager to interpret any visible evidence to the contrary in favour of Tristran and Iseut. Subsequently Marc is prepared to accept both private and public forms of reparation for the sake of peace and order. The purpose of the public reconciliation of Marc and Iseut at the Gué Aventuros and of Iseut's public oath on the Blanche Lande is to establish ever more firmly the King/Queen axis.

It is perhaps ironic that complete harmony is achieved only when, by different trajectories, the concerted efforts of Marc, Tristran and Iseut converge in actively resisting the group whose sworn purpose is to prevent any such triadic relationship.

Initially the group of barons and their allies (a dwarf, an unwitting forester and a spy) envious of the power, position and privileges of Tristran in the Kingdom are bent on destroying the Marc/Tristran relationship. The existence of a Tristran/Iseut axis provides them with an excellent opportunity for pursuing this goal; and they are prepared to use any means at their disposal to achieve it, including threats made against the King himself. They are responsible for continually bringing to Marc's hearing and engineering convincing visual evidence for Marc as to the fact of the physical involvement of the lovers, which according to the criteria they choose to apply, must constitute an offence to the King. Furthermore they are quite prepared to sacrifice the Marc/Iseut relationship in the achievement of their primary goal of the destruction of the Marc/Tristran axis.

While this group is on the attack, and so long as they have Marc's ears, their attempts at disruption are largely successful. There is little doubt that their most successful ruse, almost their moment of triumph, is in the Flour on the Floor scene. The seizure of the lovers that night in the King's chamber, the damning evidence of blood, the King's cry of 'This is only too clear evidence. You are proven guilty' provides that moment in the story in which any hope of preserving harmony within the Marc/Tristran and Marc/Iseut relationships seems to be irrevocably shattered.

The difficulty at this point for Tristran is particularly acute, for Marc and the barons have taken cause together against him. He must at one and the same time remain loyal to the King and repudiate the action of the barons. The barons' ruse, of course, has been to act through the King, hoping thereby to lead Tristran (and Iseut) into open disloyalty and treason. But Tristran makes it clear that he still has no quarrel with the King (v.793), and moreover that, as a loyal vassal, he is prepared to accept the King's judgment: 'Now whether it turn out well or ill, deal with me as you will, and I am ready to endure what your good pleasure determines' (vv.794-6).

Even the politically astute arguments made by Dinas in terms of maintaining good order in the kingdom and in favour of releasing the Queen into his custody fall on deaf ears (cf. ex.6).

Marc refuses, at this point, any consideration of pardon or pity. It is only when Marc is able to free himself of the baleful influence of the barons that he is able to recognise that Tristran must continue to fulfil his liberating/avenging role against the present internal enemies of peace and order as he has done in the past against an external enemy, the Morholt. That moment of recognition does finally come to Marc in a burnt-out clearing on the heath, when the barons demand a further public vindication of innocence on the part of Iseut.

Marc has already acceded to their demands to have Tristran excluded from the kingdom for a year. A public reconciliation with Iseut as Queen has been achieved. Tristran's public offer to defend Iseut's honour and loyalty in combat has gone unchallenged. Marc's estimate of the situation now is that the barons are attempting to separate him from his Queen by having her sent away (vv.3060-1). Their demands are pointless and unjustified. Marc shortly afterwards reports the incident and his decision to Iseut and promises that Tristran will be brought back as his avenger (ex.12).

Tristran does of course subsequently take vengeance on Denoalan (ex.15) and Godwin (ex.16) and although the text presents that vengeance in terms of immediate wrongs committed against Iseut(13 & 15) and himself (16), those actions are perfectly consistent with Marc's express desire for vengeance to be taken on the barons.

These actions taken in the latter part of the romance are quite in conformity with the views of the appropriate vengeance to be taken counselled by Arthur and three of his chosen knights when they offer to stand surety for Iseut's good name as Queen (ex.14). They may be

read (despite certain factual discrepancies) as the fulfilment of the appropriate vengeance attributed to God at one point in the narration (ex.11).

With the public and firm reestablishment of the Marc-Iseut axis, Tristran is able to define himself and to act again not only as the King's protector/avenger but even more firmly as that of the Queen. One of the primary functions of Tristran's successful jousting on the Blanche Lande as the incognito Black Knight of the Mountain, prior to her oath, is to establish himself in that role. Certainly there has been no publicly acknowledged reconciliation of Marc and Tristran, but by the end of the fragment a working and workable triadic relationship has been achieved. The interests of King, Queen and loyal vassal are now seen to converge.

I am not arguing here for a radical separation of two standards in the text that we might label as 'secular' and 'religious'. But I am arguing that the demands of private vengeance and private morality are to be subsumed by the demands of public *pax* and *ordo*. Both the existence and the operation of the two standards are most clearly illustrated in the two visits to the hermit Ogrin to which I turn in conclusion. In the first visit to Ogrin,the hermit appeals to an absolute religious standard and speaks of sin, repentance, confession, forgiveness. This standard is shown to be inapplicable to the lovers's situation.

By the time of the second visit to Ogrin, the love potion has worn off. The lovers still acknowledge no guilt according to any absolute religious standard; but they are now in a position to acknowledge social fault deriving from their guiltless love, and they are now in a position to take steps to have reconciliation effected.

Ogrin, for his part, does not deny the absolutist standard applicable to private morality, but he is clearly ready to subordinate it to the demands of social harmony. By his letter and advice as to the appropriate lines of action to be taken, he does everything in his power to achieve that mutually satisfactory reconciliation of the lovers, Tristran and Iseut, with Marc, as their King.

J. Keith Atkinson
(French, Queensland)

1. Use was made of G. Andrieu, J. Piolle, M. Plouzeau, ***Le Roman de Tristan de Beroul. Concordancier complet des formes grephiques occurrentes*** Aix-en-Provence, 1974. This concordance is based on the editions of E. Muret, ***Beroul, Le roman de Tristan,*** 4ème édition, revue par L.M. Defourques, Paris, 1974, and that of A. Ewert, ***The Romance of Tristran by Beroul,*** (Oxford, t.I (1939), t.II (1970). In addition to these two editions, that of J.C. Payen, ***Tristan et Yseut,*** Paris, 1974 and the study of T.B.W. Reid, ***The Tristran of Beroul. A Textual Commentary,*** Oxford, 1972 have been used to establish a critical text for this paper.
2. The translations offered rely heavily but not exclusively on the English translation of A.S. Fedrick, ***The Romance of Tristan by Beroul,*** Harmondsworth, 1970.
3. Within the framework of rather different arguments, the crucial role played by Marc in the organisation of the text is demonstrated recently by C.A. Van Coolput, 'Le roi Marc dans le Tristan de Béroul', ***Le Moyen Age,*** 84 (1978), 35-51 and J. Ribard, 'Le Tristan de Beroul, un monde de l'illusion?', ***Bibliographic Bulletin of the International Arthurian Society,*** 31 (1979), 229-44. Cf. Ribard, p. 235 'C'est, en définitive, le roi Marc qui est le pivot du roman . . . '.
4. For a more radically political interpretation, see R.H. Bloch, ***Medieval French Literature and Law*** (Berkeley,,1979), pp. 238-48.
5. Cf. D. Boutet et A. Strubel, ***Littérature, politique et société dans la France du Moyen Age*** (Paris, 1979), pp. 27-33.
6. The Marc/Iseut axis is in jeopardy before it is properly established; as Tristran writes to Marc: 'N'eüs gaires o li esté, Quant losengier en ton reigné Te firent acroire menconge' (vv. 2565-7).

7. On the significance of this vassalic bond, see F. Barteau, ***Les romans de Tristan et Iseut. Introduction à une lecture plurielle*** (Paris, 1972), pp. 32-4. Cf. the crowd's recognition of Tristran's role, vv. 844-50.
8. See the important article by T. Hunt, 'Abelardian Ethics and Beroul's Tristan', ***Romania,*** 98 (1977), 501-40.
9. Note that, as reported by Perinis, disloyalty is specifically denied by Tristran at the Gué Aventuros (vv.3419-23). His loyalty is not to be doubted (vv. 793-6).
10. P. Jonin, ***Les personnages féminins dans les romans français de Tristan au XIIe siècle*** (Aix-en-Provence, 1958), pp. 59-73.
11. On this institutional interpretation of the exchange, see J. Marx, 'Observations sur un épisode de la légende de Tristan', ***Mélanges Clovis Brunel*** (Paris, 1955), II, 269-70. The attack on this position by E. Vinaver, 'La forêt de Morois' ***Cahiers de civilisation médiéval,*** 11 (1968), 1-13, claiming that the exchange 'ne fait qu'affirmer sa [King Marc's] présence dans la vie des amants' (p.8), does not in fact invalidate Marx's interpretation.